

REMARKS

Claims 1-85 are pending in this application. Claims 83 and 85 were previously withdrawn. Claims 1 and 84 are amended. Claims 78-82 are canceled. No new matter is being added.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Radjy (US 2002/0010525 A1). Claim 1 as amended recites:

A method for facilitating transactions between a product brand manager and manufacturing organizations using a transactional computer system, the method comprising:

- receiving at the transactional computer system product brand information from the product brand manager, the product brand information including information for manufacturing a product brand;
- receiving at the transactional computer system from each of the manufacturing organizations information about the manufacturing process capabilities of the manufacturing organization;
- determining from the received product brand information and the received information about the manufacturing process capabilities of the manufacturing organizations a set of candidate manufacturing organizations for the product brand, the determination made without providing the product brand information to the manufacturing organizations or the manufacturing process capabilities to the product brand manager; and
- providing information about the set of candidate manufacturing organizations to the product brand manager.

The claimed invention allows product brand managers to obtain information about which manufacturers possess the capability to manufacture a product brand, while at the same time preserving the product brand information in confidence by not communicating it to the manufacturers, and preserving the manufacturing capabilities of the manufacturers in confidence by not disclosing to the product manager capabilities of those manufacturers not determined to be a match.

Radjy does not disclose the elements of claim 1. Radjy discloses a “concrete exchange” for providing feedback about concrete batch information to suppliers and purchasers (see, e.g., [0022] – [0026]; [0121] – [0123]; and Abstract). Unlike the claimed invention, Radjy does not disclose “determining a set of candidate manufacturing organizations for the product brand . . . without providing the product brand information to the manufacturing organizations”. Indeed, in the portion of Radjy cited by the Examiner, either the AEC (which the Examiner considers to be the product manager) “is free to utilize the concrete exchange

system to locate the necessary suppliers for his concrete on his own" ([0130]), or "the AEC may post a request for information . . . Then, a sales or technical services representative 516 from the target (prospective concrete manufacturer) company will preferably contact the AEC to discuss the project" ([0131]). Both of these disclosed scenarios require disclosure either by the AEC (product manager) to the concrete manufacturers, or by the concrete manufacturers to the AEC. Accordingly, Radjy does not disclose "determining a set of candidate manufacturing organizations for the product brand . . . without providing the product brand information to the manufacturing organizations" as claimed, and thus claim 1 is patentable over Radjy.

Dependent claims 2-77 are also patentable over Radjy, both because each recites its own patentable features, and because each depends from patentable claim 1.

Independent claim 84 is similarly patentable over Radjy. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Radjy does not disclose a "transactional computer system adapted to . . . make the selection of the at least one candidate manufacturing organization without providing the product brand information to the manufacturing organizations or the manufacturing organization information to the product brand manager" as claimed. Accordingly, claim 84 is patentable over Radjy and the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of these Amendments and Remarks, the Examiner is asked to withdraw the previously-issued rejection and to issue a Notice of Allowance. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone, mail or e-mail should additional issues remain outstanding.

Respectfully submitted,
MICHAEL SAUCIER, *ET AL.*

Dated: January 3, 2007

By: /Daniel R. Brownstone 46,581/
Daniel R. Brownstone, Reg. No.: 46,581
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2358
Fax.: (650) 938-5200
dbrownstone@fenwick.com